



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

July 3, 2003

Mr. Jim Hund  
Hund & Harriger  
4021 84<sup>th</sup> Street  
Lubbock, Texas 79423

OR2003-4589

Dear Mr. Hund:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 183782.

The City of Lubbock (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding city reorganizations and the requestor's employment status. You state that most of the responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments made on the requestor's behalf. Gov't Code §552.304.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by statute. Section 551.104(c) of the Government Code provides that "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying *only under a court order* issued under Subsection (b)(3)." (emphasis added). Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. See Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988). You do not indicate that the requestor has presented the city with a court order requiring disclosure of the certified agendas. Therefore, the city must withhold any responsive certified agendas or tapes of closed meetings pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code.

You claim that a particular memorandum submitted in Exhibit D is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981). For purposes of section 552.103(a), this office considers a contested case under the Texas Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), Government Code chapter 2001,

to constitute "litigation." Open Records Decision No. 588 at 7 (1991) (construing statutory predecessor to the APA).

On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

You inform this office that the requestor filed an employee grievance prior to the city's receipt of the request for information. You assert that after the administrative process has concluded, "the employee may then file [a] claim with the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or file suit in court." However, you do not inform us that the administrative hearing regarding the grievance will be conducted under the APA. After carefully reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we find that the city has failed to present us with concrete evidence that litigation was reasonably anticipated by the city on the date that it received this request. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold the information at issue pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You next claim that the submitted information in Exhibit E is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code, which protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in

furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). Based on our review of your representations and the submitted information in Exhibit E that the city claims to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.107, we agree that this information reflects confidential communications provided to the city in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to a client. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may withhold the information in Exhibit E pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

Next, you assert that the highlighted information in Exhibit F is excepted from disclosure under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117 excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5* (1989). Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the city received the request for this information. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the city must withhold the employees’ home addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers, and any information that reveals whether these employees have family members. The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117 for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

For those employees who did not make a timely election under section 552.024, social security numbers may be withheld in some circumstances under section 552.101 of the Government Code. A social security number or “related record” may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See Open Records Decision No. 622* (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no

---

<sup>1</sup>As section 552.107 is dispositive, we do not address your section 552.111 claim for this information.

basis for concluding that any of the social security numbers in the file are confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Public Information Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number information, the city should ensure that no such information was obtained or is maintained pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

In summary, the city must withhold any responsive certified agendas or tapes of closed meetings pursuant to section 552.101. The city may withhold the information in Exhibit E pursuant to section 552.107(1). For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the city must withhold the employees' home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and any information that reveals whether these employees have family members. Social security numbers not otherwise excepted under section 552.117 may be confidential under federal law. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877)673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512)475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 183782

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sharlette Chowning  
7006 61<sup>st</sup> Street  
Lubbock, Texas 79407  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lori M. Carr  
Gardere Wynne Sewell L.L.P.  
3000 Thanksgiving Tower  
1601 Elm Street  
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761  
(w/o enclosures)